

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 14, 16, 17, 18, and 20 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,934,361 to Michel et al. (Michel). Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection cannot be sustained. As the Examiner is aware, a reference anticipates a claim only when it discloses each and every feature set forth in the claim. Applicants personal respiratory protection device requires that the first and second portions of the bayonet attachment system be "incapable of being inadvertently separated." Applicants have defined this term to mean that "first and second portions are permanently joined or can be only separated through use of a key that unlocks the first and second portions without breaking or destroying either portion or a part that is used to provide a connection between such portions, which connection is only non-destroyingly separable by the key thereof." Michel does not disclose a personal respiratory protection device that meets this definition. The Examiner's attention is directed to Michel particularly at column 6, lines 54-65. Michel states that the cartridge is held in position "unless a positive and deliberate torque is applied." This statement indicates that the cartridge can be removed through rotational movement. Accordingly, Michel does not disclose a filter cartridge that is permanently joined to the mask body or that can only be separated through use of a key. Michel's filter cartridge apparently can be removed by positive and deliberate torque. Lacking any disclosure of this particular feature of applicant's invention, Michel would not have anticipated applicants' invention under the terms of 35 USC § 102(b).

Applicants' claimed subject matter also would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill for similar reasons. Michel contains no teaching or suggestion of applicants' bayonet attachment system. As such, Michel would not have rendered applicants' invention obvious to a person of ordinary skill within the meaning of 35 USC § 103.

Please reconsider the outstanding rejections in light of the comments presented above.

Respectfully submitted,

May 24, 2006

Date

By: 

Karl G. Hanson, Reg. No.: 32,900

Telephone No.: 651-736-7776

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833